Four Pages Summing Up NATO

That West European Revolt at the Paris Conference May Easily Be Overestimated

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 1 JANUARY 6, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

How John Foster Mitty Triumphed at Versailles

I

The advance billings contained a curious comparison. The word passed out at those private briefings to which only Grade A homogenized Washington correspondents are invited was that the NATO conference would be the greatest since Versailles. Subconsciously someone seemed to think that the war had already been fought to a successful conclusion. In Walter Mitty-like moments of euphoria, the State Department may have pictured the conference as another Versailles at which it would dictate unconditional surrender to an enemy laid low so swiftly by long distance pushbutton that there was no need to disturb Detroit's plans to put higher tail fins on next year's models. (How Mr. Dulles must dream of that moment when, atheistical materialism having bit the dust, he can lead an abject Krushchev to the baptismal font while Mme. Furtseva hies her to a newly reopened nunnery!) Such are the pleasant visions which forty winks after lunch brings elder statesmen.

As it turned out, we had difficulty in imposing terms even on our allies. In a sense the Russians turned up at this new Versailles but only to take their seats almost as full members of NATO. Mr. Dulles must have felt surrounded at the conference table by that indefatigable letter-writer, Marshal Bulganin, who might now be described as the inventor of the intercontinental missive. The success of this new form of bombardment may be measured by the fact that for the first time it severed Mr. Dulles from his diplomatic Siamese twin, Dr. Adenauer. The Paris meeting might be summed up by saying that the Secretary of State came to conquer, and stayed to correspond—or at least promise to.

Not Even A Moral Commitment

There was an exchange of promises. Our NATO allies promised *in principle* to take our missiles while we promised *in principle* to reopen negotiations with the Russians. Both promises closely examined confirm Mr. Dulles's astringent remarks at his last press conference before Paris about the value of agreements in principle. The vague nature of the missiles agreement was revealed by the evasiveness of Gen. Laurie Norstad's interview on *Meet the Press* in Paris after the conference adjourned. When Marquis Childs asked the NATO commander what he could do if an allied country refused to take missile bases, Gen. Norstad replied that it was not necessary for every NATO member to have missiles. When William H. Lawrence followed this up by asking whether the NATO agreement represented a moral commitment to take missiles, Gen. Norstad answered, "I'm afraid that question isn't susceptible to a yes or no answer."

Let Freedom Ring—But Not Too Loudly

"It is for us, together, to determine whether men shall continue to live in freedom and in dignity or whether they are to become mere vassals of an all-powerful state. . . . As we begin our NATO's deliberations, I shall be thinking of France's greatest words—liberty, equality and brotherhood."

—Ike's speech on arriving in Paris, Dec. 14

"Moreover the (French) Civil Service Act prohibits that any reference be made in the employe's file of his political association or of his philosophical and religious beliefs."

—Same day, Washington, warning in Library of Congress survey on the lack of American-style loyalty and security regulations in NATO countries.

Unfortunately both sides managed to exchange checks calculated to bounce. The nature of the agreement to reopen negotiations with the Russians is equally obscure, as is the question of whether West European statesmen were serious about peace in exacting that promise or merely going through the motions to satisfy a public opinion less numb than our own. The so-called European revolt against American domination of NATO may easily be exaggerated. Paul Johnson reported from Paris in the London *New Statesmen* of December 28 that Macmillan "held a confidential briefing of top U. S. journalists. America was not to worry, he told them, because Britain had endorsed the demand for East-West talks; he only did it to satisfy public opinion at home. . . ." Dr. Adenauer's conversion to negotiation may be similarly suspect. As the conference closed, a dispatch from Bonn (*New York Times*, Dec. 21) said both Herr Ollenhauer, leader of the Social Democrats, and the leadership of the Free Democrats were suspicious that the West "would make only a perfunctory effort at a political solution to the East-West tension and then push on with the armaments race."

II

Peace Lost With Norway's Resolution

Neither the widespread West European hostility to missile bases nor the inane quality of that TV report by Eisenhower and Dulles on the Paris conference should blind one to the shrewd plans and powerful influences moving toward an intensified arms race. The game was lost at Paris when the NATO Council rejected the Norwegian resolution to defer a decision on missiles "until all efforts to come to terms with the Soviet Union had been exhausted." Pineau's formula to "establish the principle of stationing missiles and warheads in

(*Continued on Page Two*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dulles Launches A New Marshall Plan Tied This Time to Armament

(*Continued from Page One*)

the countries desiring them while expressing a continuing willingness to explore settlement of political and disarmament problems with the Soviet Union" was made to order for the State Department and the Pentagon.

Consultation—With Our Own Men

This flabby formula might still be the framework for effective pressure if earlier proposals from Canada and Western Europe for closer NATO political consultation had been adopted. But Mr. Dulles is as unwilling to negotiate with our allies as with the Russians. A year ago the so called report of the three wise men of NATO—Italy's Martino, Norway's Lange and Canada's Pearson—proposed machinery for joint consultation, for "the discussion of problems collectively, in the early stages of policy formation, and before national positions become fixed." Such consultation might provide a brake on the arms race and a prod toward negotiation. Instead of establishing such machinery, however, the NATO Council could agree only that "Our permanent representatives will be kept informed of all governmental policies which materially affect the alliance and its members." This is a promise to consult, if at all, only with our own representatives on NATO. To keep them informed is hardly the same as to discuss problems collectively in advance of taking up fixed positions of policy.

What The Poles Fear

Mr. Dulles's conception of "interdependence" has always been that of a one-way street, and he has hit on an ingenious program for tying Western Europe economically and politically to the arms race. Not enough attention has been paid to the full implications of the program he advanced the first day of the Council meeting for a coordinated West European arms production industry to be supported by "procurement for our own forces as well as for our military assistance programs." This is the germ of a new Marshall plan, but a Marshall plan tied to armament rather than reconstruction. Europe would be given a chance to earn dollars by turning out munitions for the American market. This would have several consequences. It would make larger sections of European industry dependent on a continued arms race, and therefore a political factor against negotiation and relaxation of tension. By stepping up the arms race through wider West European participation, we would force similar diversions of industrial capacity in the Soviet bloc from consumer goods to arms production, a move the Poles especially fear. The belief here is that by stepping up the pace and reducing consumer goods supply in the Soviet bloc, we can increase tension and repression within the Soviet Union and its satellites. It is also calculated that if West European countries begin to produce missiles, it will increase the demand for the nuclear warheads with which to arm them. This is a program for creating abroad the kind of vested interests in tension which already exist at home.

The motivations and the strategy of this course may be read between the lines of the "leak" to the *Washington Post* (Dec. 20) of the so-called Gaither report. Its conclusion, according to the *Post's* account, was that the recommended additional expenditures on arms and shelters "would come at a fortuitous moment in the American economy . . . with benefit both to the economy and to the national defense." The committee which worked on the Gaither report, the *Post* account says, "started on the premise of a recession, not of further inflation." A heightened arms race is advocated as a means of stopping the slump in business and the stock market.

A Form of Economic Warfare

At the same time the Gaither report envisages stepped up arms output as a means of economic warfare against the Soviets. The *Washington Post* said the Gaither committee was

Moral Lesson from His Madrid Visit Mr. Dulles Won't Welcome

"A decade ago many Americans would have voted with enthusiasm for the extermination of the Japanese and the Germans. Today, faced with what we think of as new necessities, we count them as allies.

"Why should anyone assume that the case will be totally different with the Russians. As this year draws to its close, the dominant mood in America is that an unbridgeable gulf divides Moscow and Washington. There is a tendency to think that our differences, really minor differences as compared to those which split us off from Japan and Hitler's Germany, can never be reconciled.

"Nothing in history, or even in recent experience, supports this estimate of the situation. It is an estimate which derives from propaganda, impulsiveness and immature thinking. If any American Secretary of State, in 1957, can go to Madrid to chat with Franco as a friend and ally, it is childish to suppose that there is something in the stars, or in Communist dogma, which eternally rules out a similar visit to Moscow."

—Editorial, Washington Star (Ind. Cons.), Dec. 26

Dare We Recognize Good Sense When It Comes From Moscow?

"It is exactly the present course of the United States and some of its NATO partners that undermines their authority and prestige, and the further it goes, the stronger the effect will be. . . .

"We are convinced that the replacing of the policy of 'from positions of strength,' the policy of keeping the world 'on the brink of war' by a different policy aimed at ending the arms race, at lessening international tension and at developing cooperation among states, primarily in the field of trade, would, on the contrary, greatly enhance the authority and prestige of the United States, as well as of other states which follow in the wake of American policy."

—Gromyko speech, Supreme Soviet, Moscow, Dec. 21.

"We declare that however acute the ideological differences between the two systems the Socialist and the capitalist—we must solve questions in dispute among states not by war, but by peaceful negotiation. We suggest that competition in inventing new weapons be replaced by peaceful competition. The history of a social system will be decided not by rockets, not by atomic and hydrogen bombs, but by the fact of which system ensures greater material and spiritual benefits to man." *—Krushchev, same session.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Real Meaning of the Gaither Report Is in Terms of Economic War

"unfavorably" impressed with the long term rate of Soviet industrial growth which it estimates to be about twice our own. "This growth, admittedly based on a less 'mature' industrial economy and apparently beginning to slow down," the *Washington Post* said, "permits the Kremlin to devote about 25 percent of its production to the military compared to only about 8.7 percent of American production so committed. The Soviet gross product is only one one-third that of America. In another ten years it is estimated to reach about one-half the American figure, because of a faster rate of growth." The Gaither report calculates, according to the *Post,* that if the U. S. added about 10 percent to its defense commitment in terms of gross product, the Soviets would have to raise theirs by one-third and do so in a nation already on the meagerest ration of consumer goods."

III

So we emerge from the NATO Paris conference with no real change of position. We still regard the arms race as a means of maintaining prosperity at home and poverty in the Soviet bloc. We believe that if the heat is only kept on long enough the Russians will be so eager for disarmament that they may even surrender on Germany. In this perspective, it is strange to have the President questioning Russian sincerity about disarmament since the foundation of this whole policy is a belief that Moscow wants and needs arms reduction so desperately it will some day pay a huge price for it.

This is, it goes without question, a most dangerous game but there is no sign of real opposition to it. The Democrats are on the whole more devoted to the arms race even than the Republicans. No Democrat says what Kennan or Lester Pearson or Hugh Gaitskell has been saying; none of them questions the arms race, as General Bradley did.

Some Lieut. May Pull the Trigger

"The instability of the armaments situation can only grow worse if present technological trends continue and no political controls are devised. As large numbers of fast-flying missiles come into the possession of both sides, ready for use, critical command will tend to devolve to lower and lower echelons. To some extent this is already occurring. If we are going to be able to retaliate effectively it will become less and less practicable to assemble the Congress or even for the President to be consulted when missiles with the ultimate destructive power are seen flying toward us. Effective retaliation must be instant indeed. Who at that moment will hold the fate of the world in his hands? In the face of such degeneration of command, agreement on effective forms for the control of absolute weapons is the alternative to ultimate destruction."

—Lloyd V. Berkner, member, President's Scientific Advisory Committee, "Earth Satellites and Foreign Policy," Foreign Affairs Quarterly, Jan. 1958.

No Way Really to Investigate

A sampling of opinion expressed by the more intelligent Democrats in Congress is cause for despair. Green of Rhode Island returns from Europe to say that its prosperity shows it can easily afford a larger arms budget. Mansfield of Montana, the party whip in the Senate, supported the Eisenhower-Dulles missile bases policy in an extraordinarily vapid TV interview on *Face the Nation* December 15. The "radicals" of the House, a group of 12 Democrats which includes Reuss of Wisconsin and Jimmy Roosevelt, issued a statement criticizing Dulles's no-negotiation article in *Life* but declaring themselves "pleased with the decision of the NATO countries to work out ways for sharing missiles and nuclear weap-

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Nye Bevan, in the Commons Debate on NATO, Deplores the Official "Liturgy of Hate"

"The Communists used to delude themselves into believing that they would benefit from war. They believed that the extension of the frontiers of the Communist world would arise from war, and that the last two world wars had justified that belief.

"When I discussed this with Mr. Krushchev, I pointed out that they could not rest any hopes of this sort on a third world war, because that would wipe out the capitalist world and the Communist world (Opposition cheers). There exists between us and the Communist world, whatever we may say against their policies, structure, principles and practice, at least one common bond, and that is to avoid a third world war breaking out (Opposition cheers).

"There has been no implementation of that recognition, and, if it is a fact, instead of issuing homilies against each other as Mr. Foster Dulles did immediately after the NATO conference, in which he adopts an almost religious attitude —(Opposition cheers)—and that is what I find so detestable about those speeches, they are always so attitudinizing and moralizing—(Opposition cheers)—we have an atmosphere charged with irrationalities in which we cannot discuss the realities of the situation at all. (Renewed Opposition cheers).

"Mr. Dulles had said, 'This materialistic atheistic despotism aimed at dominating the world is a formidable challenge.' (Ministerial cheers). Have we armed ourselves to fight atheism? (Loud Opposition cheers) . . . The whole of that language is . . . the language of a religious war. (Opposition cheers).

"I am not here for one moment trying to justify the Communist point of view. (Ministerial cries of 'oh' and Opposition cheers). I am trying to point out that what we must strive to avoid is getting the world polarized by two irrational attitudes. . . . This was one of the things which depressed me in Washington, and it emerges in the document [on the NATO meeting] . . . I did not find inspiration so much as obsession. . . .

"We believe there are people all over the world, and particularly in the United States, who would prefer that Great Britain would take a stronger and more independent line in foreign affairs. I believe . . . that American official opinion lags for behind the readiness of the American people themselves. We believe the Government could put more heart into the whole world by taking a more independent lead.

"We are profoundly distressed that representative after representative of the Government gets up and repeats over and over again this liturgy of hate, injects into the international situation no element of buoyancy or optimism at all, and has no advice to give the nation except pile up one more tier of ridiculous armaments on the useless pile already created. (Prolonged Opposition cheers)."

—NATO Debate, House of Commons, Dec. 20

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Democrats Attack Dulles — But Faithfully Follow His Lead

(*Continued from Page Three*)

ons with our European allies" and pledging themselves "to support any changes in law necessary to accomplish this." The very Democrats who make Dulles their whipping boy do not have the imagination, insight or courage to do other than follow dutifully in the path of his policies. No one questions the wisdom of an arms race, no one speaks of the need to provide an economic substitute for arms orders, no one speaks the language of peace.

To End Nuclear Testing

The conservative *Washington Star* has been advocating negotiation and co-existence but without finding an echo among the Democrats. The *Washington Post* in a striking editorial Dec. 13 suggested that the U. S. accept Bulganin's proposal for a cessation of nuclear testing and propose on its own a ban, with inspection, against ICBM's and IRBM's. No Democrat takes it up. No one with any knowledge of Poland can doubt the desperate sincerity of Rapacki's proposal to make Central Europe an area clear of nuclear weapons, but no one here even discusses it. The truth is that Washington, whether Republican or Democratic, just is not interested in disarmament and does not want relaxation of tension.

A striking example of Democratic bankruptcy on foreign policy was provided by Pennsylvania Senator Joseph Clark's reaction to the Gaither report leak in the *Washington Post*. On domestic policy, Clark is a veritable second George Norris. On foreign policy, he faithfully regurgitates the nonsensical cud of those two bloodthirsty idiots, Symington and Jackson. Clark took the Gaither report hook, line and sinker, its "horrifying facts" and the "desperate need" it supposedly discloses. But on a domestic matter Senator Clark would never think of accepting without question the one-sided views of an Administration committee, briefed in private by the very agencies they were supposed objectively to study. Policy ought to be formed in the open, on the basis of public hearings, in which all points of view are explored, not determined by a small elite in secret sessions on the basis of secret evidence. What was the evidence here? The self evaluations of the military and of Central Intelligence. The Gaither committee under these circumstances necessarily became the sounding board of military desire for larger appropriations.

Words to Engrave in An Atom Bomb Shelter

"A great gulf has been opened between man's material advance and his social and moral progress, a gulf in which he may one day be lost if it is not closed or narrowed. . . . The stark and inescapable fact is that today we cannot defend our society by war since total war is total destruction, and if war is used as an instrument of policy, eventually we will have total war. . . . If we could internationally display on this (peace) front some of the imagination and initiative, determination and sacrifice, that we show in respect of defense planning and development, the outlook would be more hopeful than it is. The grim fact, however, is that we prepare for war like precocious giants and for peace like retarded pygmies."

—Lester Pearson, Canada's former Foreign Secretary, accepting the Nobel peace prize, Dec. 11

It was not a Royal Commission, studying the arms race afresh, but another small group of hand-picked worthies given the full treatment at Pentagon and CIA. Yet there is not a single voice in the Senate or the country to question this way of coming to conclusions on life-and-death issues.

If Ike, Too, Answers Bertrand Russell

It will take a bigger revolt than Western Europe has yet staged to change this drift and make a dent on the leaden bi-partisanship of American foreign policy. We are wedded to the arms race, no matter to what abyss it may lead. Washington may not want war, but it certainly doesn't want peace. It is thus no mere error of tactics or consequence of better propaganda which has given the peace banner to Moscow. When Krushchev even writes a letter to the London *New Statesman* (Dec. 21) respectfully answering Bertrand Russell's open letter to Eisenhower and Krushchev in the same publication (Nov. 23), he establishes something of a new mark in urgent unconventional effort. We can only hope that if Jim Hagerty hears of this and decides that Ike, too, ought to answer Lord Russell (aren't we supposed to be respectful in this post-sputnik era to intellectuals?), somebody will head him off before he gets one of those State Department drafts explaining that we cannot negotiate with Moscow because the Communists don't believe in God. Neither—someone had better tell Hagerty—does Russell.

Many Thanks for the Record Response to Our Holiday Gift Offer—You Can Still Use It During January

The Anniversary Dinner

More than half the reservations have already been sold for the Fifth anniversary dinner being given the Weekly by New York Readers at 7 p. m. on January 17 at the Port Arthur Restaurant, 7-9 Mott Street, New York City. This will be a ten course Chinese banquet and there will be informal speeches by IFS and others and a free-for-all discussion. Send your reservations with check to the Weekly at once since the places available are strictly limited.

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thuredays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone: Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED